

EXHIBIT 1

Rig Baldwin V

From: Rig Baldwin V
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:13 PM
To: Duke, Neil
Subject: RE: April 11 letter

Please call me Rig.

I will respond shortly. Is there a particular urgency? I am happy to meet and confer if you want to get a motion filed.

Unrelatedly, the email address on both letters is not mine, so I actually did not get the first letter until Friday.

Rignal W. Baldwin V

BALDWINLAWLLC

111 South Calvert Street
Suite 1805
Baltimore Maryland, 21202
Office: (410) 385-5695
[Website](#) | [Attorney Bio](#)
[Attorney Bio](#)

From: Duke, Neil <nduke@bakerdonelson.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:04 PM
To: Rig Baldwin V <RBaldwinV@baldwinlawllc.com>
Subject: RE: April 11 letter

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

I'll keep this correspondence brief. Let me know if you have a response to my most recent letter, dated April 21st. I just wanted to ensure that I haven't missed anything. My thanks,

Neil E. Duke

Shareholder

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
100 Light Street
19th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202

Phone 410.862.1198
Fax 443.263.7598
nduke@bakerdonelson.com

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
represents clients across the U.S. and abroad from offices
in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi,
South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and Washington, D.C.

Under requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that, if any advice concerning one or more U.S. federal tax issues is contained in this communication (including in any attachments and, if this communication is by email, then in any part of the same series of emails), such advice was not intended or written by the sender or by Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or tax-related matter addressed herein.

This electronic mail transmission may constitute an attorney-client communication that is privileged at law. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any

From: Rig Baldwin V [<mailto:RBaldwinV@baldwinlawllc.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 4:45 PM
To: Duke, Neil
Subject: RE: April 11 letter

Mr. Duke,

I can't answer your Thursday (touché) letter until the factual questions I have raised are addressed.

As an alternative to providing you with my work product, I propose that you ask Mr. Reitz to forward you a copy of the MPIA complaint when we file and serve it. That way, you can enjoy your vacation, and I can avoid what feels like the onset of a case of excited delirium, which according to my very old copy of the DSM can be very bad for me.

Rignal W. Baldwin V

BALDWINLAWLLC

111 South Calvert Street
Suite 1805
Baltimore Maryland, 21202
Office: (410) 385-5695
[Website](#) | [Attorney Bio](#)
[Attorney Bio](#)

From: Duke, Neil <nduke@bakerdonelson.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 4:04 PM
To: Rig Baldwin V <RBaldwinV@baldwinlawllc.com>
Subject: Re: April 11 letter

Mr. Baldwin -

Thank you for your communication, and responses to my Thursday, April 11th letter. I most certainly will respond, fully, at my earliest convenience. I have explained my short-term travel circumstances. In the interim, feel free to forward to me the emails that you have been sending to the agent(s) of the Baltimore County Police Department (or other persons), to achieve compliance with plaintiffs' MPIA requests. Alternatively, for simplicity sake, if that is too great a challenge, you may elect to just provide me the name(s) of said person(s). Much appreciated.

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 16, 2019, at 9:39 PM, Rig Baldwin V <RBaldwinV@baldwinlawllc.com> wrote:

Mr. Duke,

You sent me a letter on Friday asking that I respond "at my earliest convenience." After doing a considerable amount of research, I did so.

The letter contains an assertion that I "communicat[ed] with a represented party in an active lawsuit." The implication is that I have violated the Maryland Rules of Professional Conduct. The letter also seems to imply that I have violated a local rule, the MPIA, and a yet-to-be-issued discovery order.

I think it is inappropriate to make insinuations about the performance of a fellow attorney, copy to five other attorneys, and be unavailable to clarify your position, source of legal authority, or factual basis.

I ask that you withdraw your April 11 letter.

Case 1:18-cv-02809-DKC Document 60-1 Filed 05/07/19 Page 4 of 5
Regarding your email below, I have made inquiries to the County Attorney, Michael Field, Esquire, as to whether or not Baker Donelson represents him and/or his office. I did not make an inquiry to "Baltimore County." Mr. Field's role is defined by Baltimore County Code. Please explain, at your earliest convenience, how an inquiry to him is an inquiry to "Baltimore County."

Rignal W. Baldwin V

BALDWINLAW_{LLC}

111 South Calvert Street
Suite 1805
Baltimore Maryland, 21202
Office: (410) 385-5695
[Website](#) | [Attorney Bio](#)
[Attorney Bio](#)

From: Duke, Neil <nduke@bakerdonelson.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 3:01 PM
To: Rig Baldwin V <RBaldwinV@baldwinlawllc.com>
Subject: Re: April 11 letter

Dear Counsel-

As a means of providing greater clarity, I return to my desk on Monday. At which time, I will respond to both of your inquiries. Namely, of me, and of my client, Baltimore County. Thanks for your patience.

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 15, 2019, at 5:53 PM, Rig Baldwin V <RBaldwinV@baldwinlawllc.com> wrote:

Mr. Duke,

Could you send me a copy of Baker Donelson's retainer agreement(s) with Baltimore County so that I can appropriately respond to your letter? Normally, it is something I would request pursuant to the MPIO, but in this instance I thought it would be better to simply ask you. I have looked online and was unable to find it on Baltimore County's procurement website.

Thanks,

Rig

Rignal W. Baldwin V

BALDWINLAW_{LLC}

111 South Calvert Street
Suite 1805
Baltimore Maryland, 21202
Office: (410) 385-5695
[Website](#) | [Attorney Bio](#)
[Attorney Bio](#)

Case 1:18-cv-02809-DKC Document 60-1 Filed 05/07/19 Page 5 of 5

information (PHI) or other confidential information that is in fact confidential, legally protected from disclosure and/or protected by the attorney-client privilege. If you are the intended recipient, please maintain confidentiality and be aware that forwarding this e-mail to others may result in a waiver of these protections and privileges and regardless electronic communications may be at times illegally accessed and viewed. If you are not the intended recipient, this e-mail is not intended for transmission to you, nor to be read, reviewed, used, distributed or even received by you or any other unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, please double delete it from your system immediately without copying, reading or disseminating it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail, so that our address record can be corrected. Thank you very much.